Ham-Policy Digest   Sat, 25 Dec 93   Volume 93 : Issue 549

Today's Topics:
                       cb dx activity (2 msgs)
                            code speed
            Let's all get together (code/nocode debates...)
                License Reform -- Novice/Young Enthusiasts
                  The 10-meters band - No CW required ?

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: Sat, 25 Dec 93 03:55:20 EST
From: usc.edu!math.ohio-state.edu!caen!malgudi.oar.net!wariat.org!mystis!
dan@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: cb dx activity
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

md@maxcy2.maxcy.brown.edu (Michael P. Deignan) writes:

> Someone asked:
>
> "You mean in the US the questions are known in advance?"
>
>
> Not are only the questions known, but the four choices you have
> for answers, along with what the correct answer IS.

I believe the distractors can be changed, but not the correct answer.
(could be wrong though...)

```
--
  -----------------------------------------------------------------------
  | Dan Pickersgill  N8PKV    | 'Pots have handles, Magazines have  |
  | dan@mystis.wariat.org     |     Personals, Hams have Names'     |
  -----------------------------------------------------------------------
  |          Crime in America is a thing of the PAST!!!               |
  |                  The Brady Bill is Law.                           |
  -----------------------------------------------------------------------
```

Date: Sat, 25 Dec 1993 08:54:50 GMT
From: sdd.hp.com!hp-cv!hp-pcd!hpcvaac!billn@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: cb dx activity
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

elendir@enst.fr writes:
: bill nelson (billn@hpcvaac.cv.hp.com) wrote:
:
: : In my opinion, that happened as soon as they started publishing the question
: : pool. These days, it is totally unnecessary to understand the least bit about
: : radio theory.
:
: : Bill
:
: Do you mean that in the USA, the questions are known in advance ?

Not only the questions, but the proper answer.

Bill

Date: Sat, 25 Dec 93 04:07:00 EST
From: library.ucla.edu!europa.eng.gtefsd.com!news.umbc.edu!eff!
usenet.ins.cwru.edu!wariat.org!mystis!dan@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: code speed
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

oo7@emx.cc.utexas.edu (Derek Wills) writes:

> montp@vortex.eng.sc.rolm.com (Mont Pierce) says:
>
> (in a very small extract from a long posting)
>
> >I think that all the debating that's been going on and on and
```

> >on about this issue [code speed for licenses] is proof that these
> >requirements are too high.
>
> I don't.  I don't think you can take the postings here as being
> representative of over half a million hams.  For every ham who
> complains here about the hardship of 5/13/20 wpm morse, there
> are hundreds of hams out there using morse code on the air and
> loving it.

There might be a one to hundereds ratio of hams on usenet, however for
every ham on usenet that is opposed to the code requirement there are
hundereds NOT on usenet that are also opposed.

>                    The postings here are naturally biassed towards
> those from people who feel the system is unfair to them for some
> reason.

What makes usenet hams biased one way or the other? Or do you admit that
hams in general feel the system is unfair? What makes usenet pro-nocode?

>  The majority of hams accept the license requirements,
> study the written and cw material, take the tests, pass them, get
> on the air and have fun, with or without using morse code.

Studying to upgrade because requirements are there is NOT an endorsement
of those requirements. Just because I am working on code/theroy to get
the Extra class license, does NOT mean I support those requirements.

> The "debating" that goes on here is largely the output of a small
> number of people who could better spend their time learning the
> code or finding some other hobby where the requirements are more
> to their liking.

The purpose of this newsgroup is to debate these issues. That is one of
the reasons I subscribe to it. You can count this as another hobby more
to my liking if you wish. If you don't like the discussion of topics
relating to amateur policy, don't subscribe to this newsgroup, find one
more to 'your' liking.

>  We have no-code and know-code licenses now.
> Choose one or the other and enjoy.

I do and I am.

>
> (These comments not meant as a flame against the original poster).

These comments are not meant as a flame to EITHER poster.

```
--
 ----------------------------------------------------------------------
 | Dan Pickersgill  N8PKV    | 'Pots have handles, Magazines have  |
 | dan@mystis.wariat.org     |     Personals, Hams have Names'     |
 ----------------------------------------------------------------------
 |         Crime in America is a thing of the PAST!!!               |
 |               The Brady Bill is Law.                             |
 ----------------------------------------------------------------------


------------------------------
```

In article <2ffr0d$hmm@vortex.eng.sc.rolm.com>, montp@vortex.eng.sc.rolm.com (Mont
Pierce) writes:
>
> If we took 1/10 the energy everyone has used debating code/nocode issues
> and redirected it constructively, just think what we could accomplish.
>
> I for one, and I know I'm not alone, have grown very tired of listening
> to all the debating. It is however refreshing to see the consenses that
> has occurred recently with the proposal of the Class A/Class B license
> restructure proposal. I think it addresses a couple of problems that
> almost everyone agrees on, 1) simplifying the license structure would
> decrease the time required for FCC to process license applications; and
> 2) it suggests a more reasonable code speed requirement.
>
> To me there is no point in discussing whether or not code profeceincy
> should be required. Everyone has their own point of view. There will
> never be a full agreement on this issue. So why waste the energy
> bashing one another any more. The horse has been dead for a long time,
> so let's stop beating on it and see what we CAN agree on and what can we
> constructively do about it.
>
> The ITU treaty requires code profeciency for hams on the HF air wave.
> So be it. Let's look at what is required to satisfy the treaty. The
> treaty does not indicate what speed is required to proof profeciency.
> Apparently 5 words per minute is sufficient, the novice bands are proof
> of this. Why does FCC require 13wpm and 20wpm then? Does anyone know
> how these speeds where determined?
>
> To some extent I can understand the speed requirements due to the

> Incentive Licensing policy. But, I think that all the debating that's
> been going on and on and on about this issue is proof that these
> requirements are too high. Many many hams do not have the incentive
> to learn code at such high speeds in order to upgrade. So, technically
> the Incentive Licensing plan is not working. It should be reviewed and
> revised.
>
> How do we get the FCC to revise the Licensing requirements? Can anyone
> do this on their own? How will the ARRL react to someone else
> submitting this issue to the FCC? Without a doubt, the ARRL is the most
> influential organization I know of with the FCC regarding Ham licensing
> requirements. So, the best plan of action I can see is to get the ARRL
> to propose any and all licensing changes for us to the FCC.
>
> There is a problem though. The ARRL pretends to represents the views of
> the majority of it's members. The problem is that we have to tell ARRL
> what are views are. The ARRL really can only represent the majority of
> it's members that SPEAK UP and vocalize their views.
>
> So let's all get together. Everyone that has posted an article arguing
> their views on code/nocode and any other similar or related issue should
> write to the ARRL and let them know what we think. Let's use the ARRL
> to get the changes we want. And let's make the ARRL do what the claim
> to do, that is, represent the Ham community on this issues to the FCC.
>
> The recent proposal of the Class A and Class B licensing should be sent
> to ARRL. All suggested modifications should also be sent. ARRL should
> take a poll of it's members and find out how many members want ARRL to
> followup and proceed with formalizing the proposal and submitting it to
> the FCC.
>
> In addition, as an alternative proposal I would like to submit to ARRL
> that they present a proposal to FCC to eliminate the 20wpm requirement
> for the Extra exam. Why? Because it is not fulfilling the purpose it
> was intended. It is not creating an incentive to upgrade to the Extra
> Class License. What it is doing is tearing the ham community apart.
> Likewise, the 13 wpm should be reviewed. It seems that many do agree
> that 10wpm should be the max. required speed for any ham license (this
> should be provable by ARRL taking a poll).
>
> What do you think the outcome would be if ARRL took the following poll
> from it's members?
>
>   1. How many feel that the code tests should remain as they are?
>
>   2. How many feel that the 20 wpm test should be eliminated?
>
>   3. How many feel that the 13 wpm test should be eliminated?

```
>
>      4.  How many feel that the 13 wpm test should be reduced to 10 wpm?
>
>
> I think if such a poll was taken, ARRL would be moved into action to
> work on this issue and submit the appropriate proposals to FCC.  That
> is, if the majority of it's members speak up and make their desires
> known.
>
>
> So come on everybody, let's get together.  Let's be constructive.  Let's
> write to ARRL and let them know how we all feel about this issue.  And
> maybe we'll see some action.
>
>
>
> 73,
>
> km6wt, mont
>This is the most sensible post I've read in a LONG time!If this proposal
 went through 20 years ago when I got my TOTALLY WORTHLESS novice license,
>maybe I wouldn't have gotten totally disgusted with ham radio and put my
 license away in a drawer.It took me until the no code went through to get
 back into the transmitting part of the hobby.CW has no place in ham radio
 today as far as I'm concerned.The written part can and should be made much
 more difficult then it is now,and as a compromise,if CW is still kept as
 part of the exam,it should be made to have no more value than ANY OTHER PART
 of the exam!You can bomb a whole section of the written test and if you get
 the rest right,you still pass!If you mess up the code part you are dead.I
don't feel I should have to learn about a mode I'm NOT going to use!I don't
 mind somebody working CW if it makes them happy,but I dont see the logic in
 forcing somebody to learn "another language"if all I want to speak is english!
 All I personally am interested in is SSB and RTTY.I don't care about
packet,CW,AM(transmitting)sattelites or anything else!Im willing to compromise
and settle for say a 5 wpm for the lower class and 10 for the higher if the ITU
 requirements are kept,and eliminating the code requirement if the ITU does.If
I could work cw at 120 wpm,I still wouldn't operate CW!(actually,I can,with my
computer!)Anyway,I feel it's just a matter of time before CW is like AM is now,
kind of an "antique mode"that very few care abourt any more.I'm not even going
to mention that most of the problems on the hambands today are generals and up!
(oops,I just said it!)  Anyways,I'm not writing this to piss people off,I've
been saying this to hams of every class for 20 years
                                Barry N8PVX


-----------------------------

Date: Sat, 25 Dec 93 03:58:34 EST
```

myers@sunspot.West.Sun.COM (Dana Myers) writes:

> In article <1993Dec23.174015.23679@ke4zv.atl.ga.us> gary@ke4zv.atl.ga.us (Gar
> >
> >Anyone at least at the high school sophmore level of math and reading
> >comprehension should be able to pass the new written exam with a bit of
> >effort. It won't be harder than the old First Class Radiotelephone exam,
> >and I passed that at 14. Now that does imply that very young children,
> >like the 5 year old Novices we've read about, wouldn't be able to enter
> >amateur radio. Still we have to be careful not to dilute this proposal
> >too much. I'm not sure a child of 5 *should* be allowed to supervise
> >a 250 watt transmitter. It's not quite the same thing as handing them
> >a loaded gun or putting them behind the wheel of a car, but still we
> >have to believe that it should take some degree of maturity to be handed
> >unsupervised international communications capabilities. If we want a
> >learner's permit, it should probably be under the supervision of a
> >competent licensee. And we can do that now through third party
> >operations without involving the government.
>
> I agree with Gary. Though I earlier proposed a third class, it was not
> another level of privileges, it was a intended to ward off an
> administrative problem later on.
>
> As for young people, I tend to think that making special allowances
> just to get young kids into ham radio is not a good idea.

I have to disagree here guys. Getting kids interested will only ensure
the preservation of amateur radio for generations. What better way to
keep kids off the streets and out of drug houses than to have them in
the basement playing with 40 meters? We need MORE things for kids to do
to develop 'technical' skills, not less!

--

 | Dan Pickersgill N8PKV | 'Pots have handles, Magazines have |
 | dan@mystis.wariat.org | Personals, Hams have Names' |

 | Crime in America is a thing of the PAST!!! |
 | The Brady Bill is Law. |

Date: Sat, 25 Dec 1993 10:32:58 GMT
From: usc.edu!cs.utexas.edu!swrinde!menudo.uh.edu!uuneo!sugar!
rcoyle@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: The 10-meters band - No CW required ?
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <931222.06000.EDELLERS@delphi.com>, Ed Ellers <EDELLERS@delphi.com>
writes:
> "However, there is a difference in tone..."
>
> Count me in the "former" group. The only difference is that I say "no code"
> instead of "just a little code," because I can see NO reason why "some code
> proficiency has to be demonstrated" in order for the FCC to grant HF access.
> The treaty argument has already been demolished by previous posters who pointed
> out that any administration can simply opt out by notifying the ITU.

It's the "wefare state mentality" of which you speak that I so strongly
object to, Ed. You seem to think that the FCC OWES you HF access, without
you doing a damn thing to earn it (and no, I don't count memorizing a
question pool earning it). You can talk about it until you're blue in the
face, but there's no way to justify laziness.

 --Robert
--
Kill files are an expression of resentment by the unmemorable or
untalented against the memorable and talented. Your appearance in kill
files merely marks the fact that you have more than once tried to make
people think, when they really would rather not. It is an honor.

End of Ham-Policy Digest V93 #549
****
****